

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

TROY DEIMERLY,

Plaintiff,

V.

HAROLD W. CLARKE, *et al.*,

## Defendants.

Case No. C06-5717 RJB/KLS

**ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF'S  
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Amended Complaint. (Dkt. # 35). For the reasons set forth below, the Court finds that the Amended Complaint should be stricken from the record.

## I. DISCUSSION

On January 29, 2007, Plaintiff filed this civil rights action naming Harold W. Clarke, Belinda D. Stewart, Sgt. Sullivan and John & Jane Doe as Defendants. (Dkt. # 8). Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated his Constitutional right of access of court by refusing to process his mail. (*Id.*).

Defendants filed their Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint on May 4, 2007. (Dkt. # 25). The Court entered its Pretrial Scheduling Order on May 10, 2007, ordering a discovery deadline of November 9, 2007, dispositive motions deadline of December 12, 2007 and joint status report deadline of April 11, 2008. (Dkt. # 27).

Plaintiff filed his Amended Complaint on August 13, 2007. (Dkt. # 35). Plaintiff did not seek leave prior to filing the amended complaint nor has written consent of the adverse party been

## ORDER - 1

1 submitted to the Court.

2 **II. DISCUSSION**

3 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure (“Fed. R. Civ. P.”) 15(a), “[a] party may amend  
4 the party’s pleading once as a matter of course at any time before a responsive pleading is served.”  
5 Otherwise, the party “may amend the party’s pleading only by leave of court or by written consent of  
6 the adverse party.” *Id.* Leave to amend “shall be freely given when justice so requires,” and “this  
7 policy is to be applied with extreme liberality.” *Id.*; *Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. Rose*, 893  
8 F.2d 1074, 1079 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990). After a responsive pleading has been filed, “leave to amend should  
9 be granted unless amendment would cause prejudice to the opposing party, is sought in bad faith, is  
10 futile, or creates undue delay.” *Martinez v. Newport Beach City*, 125 F.3d 777, 786 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997).

11 Plaintiff did not seek leave to file an amended complaint nor has he submitted written  
12 consent of Defendants. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint (Dkt. # 35) shall be **Stricken**.  
13 Plaintiff is directed to file a motion seeking leave to amend his complaint or obtain the written  
14 consent of Defendants prior to submitting a proposed amended complaint for this Court’s  
15 consideration.

16

17 DATED this 17th day of September, 2007.

18  
19   
20 Karen L. Strombom  
United States Magistrate Judge

21

22

23

24

25

26

ORDER - 2